

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-80 are pending in the present application. Claims 7, 31, 61 and 62 have been cancelled; Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-26, 29, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39-44 and 46-60 have been amended; and Claims 63-80 have been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings, the Title, the Abstract and Claim 60 were objected to; Claims 2-27, 29-31, 37, 39, 43-45, 49 and 54-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, 15, 22, 51, 52, 59 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Holzhauser.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicant's representatives on May 5, 2003. During the interview, differences between the present invention and the applied art, and the rejection noted in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review when a response is filed. Arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

Regarding the objection to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 8, 25, 26 and 44 have been amended to more clearly identify the structural element that is positively claimed. In particular, Claims 2, 8, 25, 26 and 44 have been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action to indicate that the structural element that is positively claimed "utilizes" an appropriate method or methods.

The structural element recited in those claims, namely the "image format unit", is clearly shown in the drawings, see for example element 101 in Figure 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings show all the features recited in the claims, and it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the objections to the Title, the Abstract and Claim 60, the Title, the Abstract and Claim 60 have been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these objections be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 7, 31, 61 and 62 have been cancelled; Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-26, 29, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39-44 and 46-60 have been amended; and Claims 63-67 have been added in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, 15, 22, 51, 52, 59 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Holzhauser. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an image formation device for forming an image on an image supporting member by an image formation unit. The image formation device includes first and second transfer units which transfer an image formed on the same image supporting member to a recording medium having front and back sides and an inverting unit which inverts the front and back sides of the recording medium by an inverting path while conveying the recording medium from the first transfer unit to the second transfer unit. The inverting unit includes a branched nail and conveyance rollers.

Amended independent Claim 59 includes similar language incorporating a branched nail and conveyance rollers.

Further, new independent Claim 67 that replaces cancelled Claim 62 is directed to an image formation system including an inputting device for inputting image data and an image formation device. The inputting device includes an image reading device for optically reading a manuscript with two surfaces. The image formation device forms an image on an image supporting member by an image formation unit based on the inputted image data. The image formation unit that includes first and second transfer units which transfer an image

formed on the same image supporting member to a recording medium and an inverting unit which inverts front and back sides of the recording medium by an inverting path while conveying the recording medium from the first transfer unit to the second transfer unit. The inverting unit includes a branched nail and conveyance rollers. The time for reading both surfaces of the manuscript of the image reading device is set to at most the time for exposing the dual sided images on the image supporting member.

In a non-limiting example, Figures 1-3 illustrate that the inverting section 104 includes a branched nail 104a driven by a solenoid, an inverting conveyance path 104b, and conveyance rollers 104c and 104d rotated by a motor. A paper 106 enters into the inverting conveyance path 104b from a first transfer section 103a and the branched nail 104a opens the first transfer section 103a side of an inlet of the inverting conveyance path 104b, as shown in Figure 2. The paper 106 is then sent out from the inverting conveyance path 104b to a second transfer section 103b side, as shown in Figure 3.

Hoizhauser discloses a turnover drum 50 that picks up a paper from a photoconductor by initially moving in a counterclockwise direction and then at an appropriate time reversing its direction to return the paper to the photoconductor (column 4, lines 17-26; and Figure 1). Conversely, the above-noted claims as currently written include an inverting unit that utilizes a branched nail and conveyance rollers in the inverting operation. It is respectfully submitted Holzhauser does not teach or suggest the claimed invention as recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 59, and new independent Claim 67. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted amended Claims 1 and 59, and new independent Claim 67, and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

As noted above new independent Claim 67 corresponds to original independent Claim 62. Further, new independent Claim 66 corresponds to original independent Claim 61 and

new dependent Claims 63, 64 and 65 correspond to original dependent Claims 7, 31 and 52, respectively. Applicant submits no new matter has been added.

In addition, new independent Claims 68-80 have been added to set forth subject matter indicated as allowable in the Office Action. New Claims are supported by the originally filed specification. New independent Claims 68-80 correspond to original dependent Claims 3, 4, 8, 12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23-26, 29, 37, 39, 43, 44, 45, 49 and 54, respectively rewritten in independent form. The outstanding Office Action indicated that those claims were allowable if rewritten in independent form and in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action, as is now the case in new independent claims 68-80. Thus, new Claims 68-80 are also believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423



22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
GJM/SS/KLL/dnf
I:\ATTY\KLL\216468US\216468US-AM.DOC